



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/905,580	07/12/2001	Shell Sterling Simpson	10007646-1	4266
22879	7590	03/17/2010		
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY			EXAMINER	
Intellectual Property Administration			CHANKONG, DOHM	
3404 E. Harmony Road				
Mail Stop 35			ART UNIT	
FORT COLLINS, CO 80528			PAPER NUMBER	
			2452	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			03/17/2010	
			ELECTRONIC	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM

ipa.mail@hp.com

laura.m.clark@hp.com

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/905,580

**Applicant(s)**

SIMPSON ET AL

**Examiner**

DOHM CHANKONG

**Art Unit**

2452

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 October 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5, 9-12, 14-17, 19, 23-26, 28, 33-36 and 38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5, 9-12, 14-17, 19, 23-26, 28, 33-36, and 38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF-08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This action is in response to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interference's decision, rendered on 10/2/2009, reversing the examiner's rejections. Claims 1-3, 5, 9-12, 14-17, 19, 23-26, 28, 33-36, and 38 are presented for further examination.

#### ***Reopening Prosecution after Board Decision***

Because the examiner had specific knowledge of the existence of a particular reference or references which indicate nonpatentability of any of the appealed claims as to which the examiner was reversed, the instant application was submitted to the Technology Center (TC) Director for authorization to reopen prosecution under 37 CFR 1.198 for the purpose of entering the new rejection. *MPEP 1214.04*.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

- I. CLAIMS 1-3, 11, 12, 15-17, 25, AND 26 ARE REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(A) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER *WOOD ET AL.* (U.S. PATENT NUMBER 6,453,127), HEREINAFTER REFERRED TO AS *WOOD*, IN VIEW OF *PHAN*, U.S. PATENT NO. 7,240,360.**

#### **Claims 1 and 15**

*Wood* as modified by *Phan* discloses a method for mediating access to production options, comprising:

acquiring a user's access request for a production device (*Wood*, column 2, line 65 through column 3, line 8);

accessing data that at least indirectly identifies those production options to which the user does not have permission to access (*Wood*, column 6, lines 1-8 and *Phan*, column 5 «lines 20-62»: discussing the user of an access control table to define a user's access to specific user interface options), each production option corresponding to feature that when implemented affects a manner in which the production device produces a target document (*Wood*, column 3, lines 54-65);

retrieving a user interface for the production device, the user interface having user accessible controls for selecting production options for the production device (*Wood*, column 5, lines 3-24 and column 3, lines 54-65);

modifying the retrieved user interface according to the accessed data so that the interface provides user accessible controls for selecting only those options for which the user has permission to access (*Phan*, Figs. 1 & 5 | column 5 «line 63» to column 6 «line 14»: *Phan* disclosing disabling (e.g., blank or grayed out) certain options in the user interface based on the user permissions specified in the access control table); and

presenting the user with the modified user interface (*Wood*, column 5, lines 3-24 & *Phan*, Fig. 5).

As indicated in the foregoing claim mapping, *Wood* did not explicitly state (1) accessing data that at least indirectly identifies those production options to which the user does not have permission to access nor does he disclose that his system could (2) modify the retrieved user interface according to the accessed data so that the interface provides user accessible controls for

selecting only those options for which the user has permission to access. However, both of these features were well known in the art at the time of Applicant's invention as evidenced by *Phan*.

*Phan* is directed to a system for controlling access to options on a user interface. *Phan* discloses utilizing an access control table to define which options a user has access and utilizing the access table to modify a retrieved user interface by disabling the options to which a user does not have access. Thus, *Phan* discloses both of the feature missing from *Wood's* system. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified *Wood* to include the access controls taught by *Phan*. Such a modification would have improved *Wood's* system by providing a means for "specifying access control for each user interface element" on a user interface [*Phan*, column 2 «lines 56-59»]. This would represent an improvement because it would allow a higher degree of management and security features in *Wood's* system as discussed above.

#### **Claims 2 and 16**

*Wood* as modified by *Phan* discloses the act of acquiring comprises intercepting an access request directed to the production device (*Wood*, column 2, line 65 through column 3, line 8).

#### **Claims 3 and 17**

*Wood* as modified by *Phan* discloses the act of acquiring comprises redirecting the access request (*Wood*, column 2, line 65 through column 3, line 8).

#### **Claims 11 and 25**

*Wood* as modified by *Phan* discloses the acts of retrieving and modifying are performed on a network device other than the production device (*Wood*, figure 2, item 30).

**Claims 12 and 26**

*Wood* as modified by *Phan* discloses the act of retrieving comprises retrieving the interface in the form of a web page, and the act of presenting comprises presenting the modified web page to a web browser (*Wood*, column 5, lines 3-24).

**II. CLAIMS 5, 9, 10, 14, 19, 23, 24, 28, 33, AND 34 ARE REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(A) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER *WOOD* IN VIEW OF *PHAN*, AS APPLIED ABOVE, FURTHER IN VIEW OF *ZOTHNER* (U.S. PATENT NUMBER 6,751,657).**

**Claims 5 and 19**

*Wood* as modified by *Phan* and *Zothner* discloses the act of accessing comprises obtaining credentials for the user and locating a user record using the credentials, the user record containing the data that at least indirectly identifies those production options to which the user does not have permission to access (*Zothner*, column 9, line 64 through column 10, line 8 and *Phan*, column 5 «lines 20-62»: *Phan*'s access control table reads on a user record).

*Wood* and *Phan* did not explicitly state accessing a user record in order to generate the interface. Although the combination of *Wood* and *Phan* does check permissions for a specific user, it is not specific about using user records. However, *Zothner*'s system describes a set of user profiles that help define the role of each user and contain security and permission information for each user. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the combination of *Wood* and *Phan* by adding the ability to access a user record as provided by *Zothner*. This would make sense because it would allow a higher degree of management and security features in the combination of *Wood* and *Phan*. *Zothner* cites the need for this expanded capability in management as being important to the availability and reliability of network systems (see column 4, line 62 through column 5, line

12), two features that are very important to the combination of *Wood* and *Phan* for information access and monitoring. This motivation also applies to those dependent claims utilizing the same combination.

#### **Claims 9 and 23**

*Wood* as modified by *Phan* and *Zothner* discloses the interface is a web page containing instructions for displaying controls for selecting production options and wherein the instructions are associated with one or more tags each tag identifying a particular production option, wherein the act of altering comprises identifying the tags for production options to which the user does not have access and altering the instructions associated with those tags (*Zothner*, column 19, line 58 through column 20, line 4).

#### **Claims 10 and 24**

*Wood* as modified by *Phan* and *Zothner* discloses the act of accessing comprises obtaining credentials for the user and locating a record for the user using the credentials, the record containing the data that at least indirectly identifies those production options to which the user does not have permission to access (*Zothner*, column 9, line 64 through column 10, line 8 and *Phan*, column 5, line 59 through column 6, line 11 and column 11, lines 26-33).

#### **Claims 14 and 28**

*Wood* as modified by *Phan* and *Zothner* discloses a method for mediating access to production options, comprising:

acquiring a user's access request for a production device (*Wood*, column 2, line 65 through column 3, line 8); retrieving a web page for the production device, the web page having user accessible controls for selecting production options (*Wood*, column 5, lines 3-24);

accessing a record established for the user, the record containing data that at least indirectly identifies those production options to which the user does not have permission to access (*Wood*, column 6, lines 1-8; *Zothner*, column 9, line 64 through column 10, line 8; and *Phan*, column 5 «lines 20-62»), each production option corresponding to feature that when implemented affects a manner in which the production device produces a target document (*Wood*, column 3, lines 54-65); and

modifying the retrieved web page according to the user's record so that the web page provides user accessible controls for only those options for which the user has permission to access (*Phan*, Figs. 1 & 5 | column 5 «line 63» to column 6 «line 14»: *Phan* disclosing disabling (e.g., blank or grayed out) certain options in the user interface based on the user permissions specified in the access control table); and

presenting the user with the modified web page so that through the web page the user can cause the production of the target document by the production device in accordance with a selection of one or more of the user accessible controls provided by the user interface (*Wood*, column 5, lines 3-24 and column 6, lines 18-34).

### **Claim 33**

*Wood* as modified by *Phan* and *Zothner* discloses in a computer network, a system for managing electronic document production, the system comprising:

a production server operable to serve to a client an interface having user accessible controls for selecting production options for a target document (*Wood*, figure 2, item 30 and column 5, lines 3-24), each production option corresponding to feature that when implemented



affects a manner in which a selected production device produces a target document (*Wood*, column 3, lines 54-65);

a permission service operable to retrieve the interface from the production server for the selected production device (*Wood*, column 5, lines 3-24), access a user's record containing data that at least indirectly identifies those production options to which the user does not have permission to access (*Wood*, column 6, lines 1-8; *Phan*, column 5 «lines 20-62»; and *Zothner*, column 9, line 64 through column 10, line 8), modify the retrieved interface according to the user's record so that the modified interface has user accessible controls for only those options for which the user has permission to access (*Phan*, Figs. 1 & 5 | column 5 «line 63» to column 6 «line 14»: *Phan* disclosing disabling (e.g., blank or grayed out) certain options in the user interface based on the user permissions specified in the access control table), and direct to the client the modified interface so that through the interface the user can cause the production of the target document by the selected production device in accordance with a selection of one or more of the user accessible controls provided by the modified interface (*Wood*, column 5, lines 3-24)

#### **Claim 34**

*Wood* as modified by *Phan* and *Zothner* discloses the system of Claim 33, further comprising a permission engine operable to generate an interface having user accessible controls for managing user records (*Zothner*, column 9, line 64 through column 10, line 8).

**III. CLAIMS 35, 36, AND 38 ARE REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(A) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER *WOOD* IN VIEW OF *PHAN* AND *ZOTHNER*, AS APPLIED ABOVE, FURTHER IN VIEW OF *ADOLFSSON* (U.S. PATENT NUMBER 6,092,078).**

**Claim 35**

*Wood* as modified by *Phan*, *Zothner*, and *Adolfsson* discloses the system of Claim 34, further comprising one or more device records, each device record containing data representing the production options offered by the particular production device, and wherein the permission engine is operable to parse the device records to generate the interface for managing the user records (*Adolfsson*, column 9, line 66 through column 10, line 10 and column 16, lines 44-50).

As indicated in the foregoing mapping, *Wood*, *Phan*, and *Zothner* did not explicitly state using device records for generating the interface or using a device locator for detecting new devices. However, *Adolfsson*'s system is substantially similar to the combination and does explicitly describe the use of device records for peripherals as well as techniques for locating peripherals new to the system. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the combination of *Wood*, *Phan*, and *Zothner* by adding the ability to use device records for generating the interface and use a device locator for detecting new devices as provided by *Adolfsson*. This would make sense because it would allow a higher degree of management and security features in the combination of *Wood*, *Phan*, and *Zothner*. *Zothner* cites the need for this expanded capability in management as being important to the availability and reliability of network systems (see column 4, line 62 through column 5, line 12). This motivation also applies to those dependent claims utilizing the same combination.

**Claim 36**

*Wood* as modified by *Phan*, *Zothner*, and *Adolfsson* discloses the system of Claim 35, further comprising: a device locator operable to detect new production devices; and an update service operable to create a device record for each newly detected production device (*Adolfsson*, column 16, line 51 through column 17, line 5).

**Claim 38**

*Wood* as modified by *Phan*, *Zothner*, and *Adolfsson* discloses in a computer network, a system for managing electronic document production, the system comprising:

a production device (*Wood*, figure 2, item 15);

one or more user records, each user record containing, for each production device, data that at least indirectly identifies those production options to which the user does not have permission to access (*Wood*, column 6, lines 1-8; *Phan*, column 5 «lines 20-62»; and *Zothner*, column 9, line 64 through column 10, line 8), each production option corresponding to feature that when implemented affects a manner in which the production device produces a target document (*Wood*, column 3, lines 54-65);

a production server in communication with the production device and operable to serve an interface for that production device, the interface having user accessible controls for selecting production options for the production device (*Wood*, figure 2, item 30 and column 5, lines 3-24);

a permission service operable to access the user's record, retrieve the interface from the production server, modify the retrieved interface according to the user's record so that the modified interface has user accessible controls for only those options for which the user has permission to access (*Wood*, column 5, lines 3-24; *Zothner*, column 9, line 64 through column

10, line 8; and *Phan*, column 5 «lines 20-62»), and to direct to a client the modified interface so that through the modified interface the user can cause the production of the target document by the selected production device in accordance with a selection of one or more of the user accessible controls provided by the modified interface (*Wood*, column 5, lines 3-24);

one or more device records, each device record containing data representing the production options offered by the production device (*Adolfsson*, column 9, line 66 through column 10, line 10);

a permission engine operable to parse the device records and generate an web page for managing user records (*Adolfsson*, column 16, lines 44-50 and column 4, lines 21-23 and *Zothner*, column 9, line 64 through column 10, line 8);

a device locator operable to detect new production devices; and

an update service operable to create a device record for each newly detected production device (*Adolfsson*, column 16, line 51 through column 17, line 5).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DOHM CHANKONG whose telephone number is (571)272-3942. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday [10 am - 6 pm].

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thu Nguyen can be reached on (571)272-6967. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/DOHM CHANKONG/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2452

/Jack Harvey/  
Director, Technology Center 2400